UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,090	02/03/2004	Margaret H. Baron	HC-P02-060	4153
28120 ROPES & GRA	7590 02/22/201 XY LLP	0	EXAMINER	
	CKETING 39/41		HOWARD, ZACHARY C	
BOSTON, MA	ATIONAL PLACE 02110-2624		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/772,090	BARON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ZACHARY C. HOWARD	1646	

	ZACHARY C. HOWARD	1646	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 70-72 and 75. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 73 and 74.		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Bridget E Bunner/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1647	

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendments to the claims filed on 1/22/10 will be entered and an explanation of how the amended claims would be rejected is provided:

In the amendments to the claims filed on 1/22/10, claim 70 is amended to include the limitation "which excess vascularization or neovascularization is associated with a tumor". This limits the claimed method to treating a subject suffering from excess vascularation or neovascularization associated with a tumor. In view of the entry of amended claim 70, the rejection of claims 70-72 and 75 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement is withdrawn in part. Specifically, the portion of the rejection directed to the breadth of subjects to be treated by the claimed method other than associated with a tumor (i.e., any form of excess vascularization or neovascularization) is withdrawn (pg 5 of the 10/26/09 Office Action). However, the rejection of claims 70-72 and 75 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is maintained herein with respect to the claims as amended for the reasons set forth previously (see pg 6-14 of the 10/26/09 Office Action).

In the response filed after final on 1/22/2010, Applicants refer to arguments set forth previously, and further provide six publications (non-patent literature; Exhibits A-F) providing evidence in support of Applicants' arguments. The evidence in the form of the six publications appear to form the basis for the only substantive new arguments by Applicants in response to the rejection set forth previously. As indicated in Section 8 of this advisory action, The evidence in the form of Exhibits A-F filed after a final action, but before the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicants failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why (for each Exhibit) the evidence is necessary and was not presented earlier. Therefore, the rejection of claims 70-72 and 75 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is maintained herein with respect to the claims as amended for the reasons set forth previously (see pg 6-14 of the 10/26/09 Office Action).

8. Applicants' response includes six publications (non-patent literature; Exhibits A-F) providing evidence in support of Applicants' arguments. Applicants' response at pg 5 specifically states that Exhibits A and B provide "further evidence". Applicants indicate that Exhibit C is submitted to "support Applicant's contention that evaluation of embryonic hemoglobin levels can be used to assess vasculogenesis in embryonic cultures" (pg 6). Exhibit D is submitted as "independent post-filing research studies" that "support Applicants' unique findings establishing a link between Shh signaling and vascular growth" (pg 6). Exhibit E and F are submitted to provide evidence that "embryonic culture systems often were used at the filing date of the instant application for the purpose of understanding angiogenesis in later development" (pg 7).

The evidence in the form of Exhibits A-F filed after a final action, but before the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicants failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why (for each Exhibit) the evidence is necessary and was not presented earlier.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because the rejection of claims 70-72 and 75 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is maintained for the reasons set forth above in sections 7 and 8.